

Appl. No. : 10/786,887
Filed : February 24, 2004

COMMENTS

Claims 19-24 and 26-29 remain pending in the present application, Claim 25 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and Claims 22, 23, and 26 having been amended. The claims set forth above include markings to show the changes made by way of the present amendment, deletions being in ~~strikeout~~ and additions being underlined.

In response to the Office Action mailed October 6, 2004, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

Drawing Objections

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for failing to illustrate an electric motor driving the throttle valve shafts at a position between the first and second throttle valves, which is recited in cancelled Claim 25. Applicant submits that because Claim 25 has been cancelled, the present objection to the drawings is moot. Thus, Applicant submits that no corrections to the drawings are needed.

Amendments To Specification Address Noted Informalities

The foregoing amendments to the specification correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. The amendments do not add new matter and overcome the Examiner's objection. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

In particular, in response to the objections to Paragraphs 26 and 30, Applicant has amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner.

In response to the objection to Paragraph 60, Applicant has deleted the second recitation of the phrase "the intake."

In response to the objection to Paragraph 92, Applicant has amended Paragraph 92 to refer to a "signal line 421."

Claim Objections

Claims 22, 23, 25, and 26 stand objected to for containing informalities. Initially, Applicant would like to point out that the objection to Claim 25 is now moot due to the cancellation of Claim 25. With respect to the remaining objections, Applicant has amended these claims solely to make these claims more easily readable and not to narrow or affect the scope of the claims. Thus, Applicant submits that all of the equivalents of the recitations in original Claims 22, 23, and 26 are also equivalents of those of amended Claims 22, 23, and 26.

Appl. No. : 10/786,887
Filed : February 24, 2004

With respect to the objections to Claims 22 and 23, Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner.

In response to the objection of Claim 26, Applicant has amended Claim 26 to recite "an electric motor configured to rotate the throttle valves."

All Pending Claims Now Fully Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicant has cancelled Claim 25 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the present rejection is moot. However, Applicant expressly reserves the right to further prosecute the original version of Claim 25 through continuation practice.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims and specification. Accordingly, early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is most earnestly solicited.

The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's attorney in order to resolve such issue promptly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: January 5, 2005

By: 

Michael A. Guiliana
Registration No. 42,611
Attorney of Record
2040 Main Street
Fourteenth Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
(949) 760-0404